



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/614,330

07/08/2003

Kwang-Il Jung

P-0486

7340

34610 7590 08/24/2009

KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/24/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/614,330	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JUNG, KWANG-IL	
	<b>Examiner</b> BRANDON J. MILLER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

I. Claims 21-23 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

II. Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "said same destination IP address and said same data link address" in lines 8-9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The following art rejection is based on the best possible interpretation of the claim language in light of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

III. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrison (US 2002/0172191 A1).

Regarding claim 13 Harrison teaches a data transmission system, comprising at least one personal computer; and a multi-access system (see paragraphs [0038] & [0041], devices 3-8 can be personal computer and access server reads on multi-access system). Harrison teaches the multi-access system including or coupled to a communication device (see paragraph [0046] and Fig. 2, Bluetooth radios 28 reads on communication device). Harrison teaches the multi-access system coupled to the personal computer through a Bluetooth connection (see paragraph [0070]). Harrison teaches wherein data packets are transmitted between the personal computer and the communication device through the Bluetooth connection, wherein the data packets are sent from the communication device for transmission via an air interface to the Internet (see paragraphs [0070] – [0072], use of OBject EXchange protocol by Access Server including communication device indicates that data packets are transmitted between the personal computer and the communication device and sent to the Internet).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 14 Harrison teaches wherein a plurality of personal computers access at least one radio communication terminal through the multi-access system (see paragraph [0041] and Fig. 1, devices 3-8 reads on plurality of personal computers and devices 15 and/or 16 reads on at least one radio communication terminal (see paragraph [0038])).

Regarding claim 15 Harrison teaches a personal computer that is a laptop computer (see paragraph [0038]).

Regarding claim 16 Harrison teaches at least one radio communication terminal; wherein the multi-access system is located between the radio communication terminal and the personal computer (see paragraph [0041] and Fig. 1, devices 3-8 reads on plurality of personal computers and devices 15 and/or 16 reads on at least one radio communication terminal (see paragraph [0038])).

Regarding claim 17 Harrison teaches wherein data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted from the personal computer for wireless transmission through a plurality of radio communication terminals (see paragraph [0042], access points 2 reads on a plurality of radio communication terminals).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

IV. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison (US 2002/0172191 A1) in view of Dantu et al. (US 7,068,624 B1).

Regarding claim 18 Harrison teaches a device as recited in claim 17 except for wherein the data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted between the personal computer and a plurality of radio communication terminals based on a same destination IP address and a same data link address, said same data link address corresponding to the personal computer. Harrison does teach wherein the data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted between the personal computer and a plurality of radio communication terminals (see paragraph [0041] – [0042]), wherein a particular address corresponds to the personal computer (see paragraph [0077] ). Dantu teaches routing data belonging to the same communication based a same destination IP address and a same data link address (see col. 14, lines 23-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted between the personal computer and a plurality of radio communication terminals based on a same destination IP address and a same data link address, said same data link address corresponding to the personal

Art Unit: 2617

computer because this would allow for an efficient method of routing (see Dantu, col. 1, lines 23-26) the data packets for transmission in Harrison.

V. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison (US 2002/0172191 A1) in view of Shibutani (US 2003/0002518 A1).

Regarding claim 19 Harrison teaches a device as recited in claim 13 including wherein the multi-access system comprises a system for receiving data packets from a plurality of computers (see paragraphs [0041] - [0042], call data reads on data packets). Harrison teaches a packet-call connection system for interfacing with one or more radio communication terminals (see paragraph [0042], access points 2 reads on one or more communication terminals). Harrison teaches a multi-access routing system for routing data packets from a multimedia system to the radio communication terminals (see paragraph [0041] - [0042], system includes capability to transmit multi-media data application and reads on multi-media system (see paragraphs [0005])).

Harrison does not specifically teach routing the data packets according to a slot assignment method.

However, Shibutani teaches a slot assignment method for routing data packets (see paragraph [0048]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the routing in Harrison adapt to include a slot assignment method because the multi-access system in Harrison transmits the data packets using a Bluetooth connection (see Harrison, paragraphs [0041] – [0042], Bluetooth is an RF system in which packets are transmitted using time slots (see Harrison, paragraph [0006])).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 20 Harrison and Shibutani teach a device as recited in claim 19 except for wherein the slot assignment is set by the plurality of computers. Harrison does teach a plurality of Bluetooth computers (see paragraph [0042], computer devices 3-8 are Bluetooth communication devices). Shibutani does teach setting a slot assignment method (see paragraph [0048]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include the Bluetooth computers setting the slot assignment because the Bluetooth computers in Harrison transmits the data packets using a Bluetooth connection (see Harrison, paragraphs [0041] – [0042], Bluetooth is an RF system in which packets are transmitted using time slots (see Harrison, paragraph [0006])).

### ***Response to Arguments***

VI. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,



Art Unit: 2617

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***

VII. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Suzuki Patent No.: US 7,103,353 B2 discloses update notification system, update monitoring apparatus, mobile communication terminal, information processing apparatus, contents acquisition instructing method, contents acquiring method, and program storing medium.

Milito et al. Patent No.: US 7,325,048 B1 discloses a method for automatically creating a modem interface for use with a wireless device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Brandon J Miller/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

August 18, 2009